

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 17, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated July 11, 2008. Claims 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 42-45 are presented for examination, of which Claims 27 and 33 are in independent form. Claims 42-45 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on July 30, 2008 to discuss the rejections in the outstanding Office Action. During the interview, the following recitation of Claim 27 was discussed: “creating a project task, associated with a resource, using a user interface, the project task having a predetermined completion time.” Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants proposed amending Claim 27 to recite “assigning the project task to an application assigned to at least one application category, the at least one application category associated with a level of skill to perform the project task.” The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment overcomes the art of record.

It is believed that this response represents a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview, in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

The Office Action rejected Claims 27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Appln. Publication No. 20030054836 (*Michot*); and rejected Claims 27, 29-30, 33 and 35-36 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,864,306 (*Dwyer et al.*). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that amended independent Claims 27 and 33, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the following reasons.

As proposed during the interview held on July 30, 2008, Applicants have amended independent Claim 27 to recite “assigning the project task to an application assigned to at least one application category, the at least one application category associated with a level of skill to perform the project task.”

Michot relates to “time-controlling” the movement or position of persons, animals or objects. Apparently, *Michot* teaches using a wireless device to track “elapsed time” (also referred to as “working time”) using “signaling messages” containing the same identification code. *See Michot*, para. 16. Nothing has been found in *Michot* that is believed to teach, reasonably suggest or otherwise result in “assigning the project task to an application assigned to at least one application category, the at least one application category associated with a level of skill to perform the project task,” as recited by amended Claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended Claim 27 is not anticipated by *Michot*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Dwyer et al. relates to a road toll collection system. Apparently, *Dwyer et al.* teaches to determine a vehicle’s time of entry into and exit from (“the transaction time”) a toll road. As described in *Dwyer et al.*,

The vehicles are detected when they enter and exit the toll road 19 which provides data indicative of the locations and times of entry into and exit from the toll road 19. The transponder 18 transmits transponder identification data to the roadside toll collectors 11 that is correlated with the vehicle detection data. The identification data, location data, and entry and exit data are processed by the roadside toll collectors 11 to generate transaction reports for each vehicle 17. The toll transaction processor 12 processes the transaction reports to generate tolling transactions for each vehicle 17. The tolling transactions are forwarded to the revenue management system 14 which generates tolls for each vehicle 17 and bills the owner of the transponders 18 for use of the toll road 19.

Dwyer et al., Col. 3, lines 28-44.

As with *Michot*, at best *Dwyer et al.* simply teaches a technique for detecting elapsed time. Nothing has been found in *Dwyer et al.* that is believed to teach, suggest or otherwise result in the “assigning the project task to an application assigned to at least one application category, the at least one application category associated with a level of skill to perform the project task,” as recited by amended Claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended Claim 27 is not anticipated by *Dwyer et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claim 33 includes features similar to those discussed above, in which the project task is assigned to an application that is assigned to at least one application category, the at least one application category associated with a level of skill to perform the project task. Therefore, claim 33 also is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants have submitted an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) herewith.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 2329398_1